

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address; COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO | |
|---|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 10/732,747 | 12/10/2003 | Joseph E. Kovach | 391/US/3 | 6535 | |
| 20686 7 | 590 07/14/2004 | | EXAMINER | | |
| DORSEY & WHITNEY, LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 370 SEVENTEENTH STREET SUITE 4700 | | | JOHNSON, BLAIR M | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | 3634 | | |
| DENVER, CC | 80202-5647 | | DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004 | DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | | 10/732,747 | KOVACH ET AL. | | | |
| | | Examiner | Art Unit / | | | |
| | · | Blair M. Johnson | 3634 | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication app | | 1 W | | | |
| Period fo | | | | | | |
| THE - External after - If the - If NO - Failur | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLIMALING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON | wimely filed ays will be considered timely. The mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | |
| Status | | | | | | |
| 1) | Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | |
| 2a)□ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This | • | | | | |
| 3)□ | - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | | | | |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | | | |
| 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ | Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | wn from consideration. | | | | |
| Applicati | ion Papers | | | | | |
| 9)[| The specification is objected to by the Examine | er. | | | | |
| 10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se | ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | |
| 11) | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | | | | | |
| Priority (| ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | |
| a) | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list | ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ntion Noved in this National Stage | | | |
| A44 | 4(-) | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) 🔲 Interview Summar | ry (PTO-413) | | | |
| 2) Notice 3) Information | te of Neierlete's Cried (PTO-032) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/10/03</u> . | Paper No(s)/Mail [| Patent Application (PTO-152) | | | |
| S. Patent and T | rademark Office | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/732,747

Art Unit: 3634

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Domel et al '852.

See references to the Silhouette ™ shade, column 6, line 27- column 17, line 18, which is motor driven and programmed to stop upon any one of several stop means, such as reed switches and overcurrent sensors. It is inherent from the use of these sensors that the shade stops moving without additional button pushing. See command sensor 29 and "flip-flop" toggles 160,162, which change directions of rotation of the drive shaft. Domel et al clearly addresses in the passage referenced above tilting of the slats separate from the raising and lowering. A single pushing of a button, whether to command a shade to raise, lower, tilt open or tilt close is clearly an obvious choice given the programmable nature of Domel et al and the expressed desire stated by Domel et al to accomplish these shade operations.

Claims 8-18,20/8-18,21/8-18 and 22/8-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al.

Bresson et al disclose a programmable Venetian blind operating device which controls raising, lowering and tilting of the slats. The device is programmable and keeps track of its movement by way of measuring rotation speed. It is inherent that the

Art Unit: 3634

device is capable of recognizing it's current position upon a command to change it's status and it would have been obvious to program it to manipulate the shade in any desired manner, i.e. raise, tilt, etc.,upon providing a signal.

Claims 19,20/19,21/19 and 22/19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bresson et al in view of Domel et al '852.

Domel, in column 25, lines 42-44, disclose that manual buttons are interchangeable with signals. In view of this teaching, it would have been obvious to modify Bresson et al to have such a manual button so as to reduce the chance of operational failure.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blair M. Johnson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0526. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lanna Mai can be reached on (703) 308-2486. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/732,747

Art Unit: 3634

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Blair M. Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 3634

BMJ 7/12/04